

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 remain in the case. Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Chen (U.S.P. 5,978,389); claims 4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Chen (U.S.P. 5,978,389) in view of McWhorter et al (Basic Electronics); and claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Chen (U.S.P. 5,978,389) in view of Matsubara et al (US 2003/0001966 A1). The only independent claims in the case are claims 1, 5, 7, and 9, all of which have been amended to avoid any inadvertent reading on the prior art and to emphasize the patentable distinctions between the present invention and the art of record including Chen, McWhorter et al and Matsubara et al. It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 5, 7, and 9 as amended, and dependent claims 2, 3, 4, 6, and 8, dependent either directly or indirectly thereon are allowable over the art of record and such action is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully submitted that Chen, as well as the balance of the art of record, fails to provide or suggest a KVM switch capable of operating in the necessary high frequency ranges required by video displays under the QXGA image resolution standard of 2048 x 1536 pixels and higher, requiring the video display to function at speeds approximating 400 MHz. Conventional KVM systems, such as the type Chen was designed to operate with, operate at much lower speeds of 250 MHz or less and, thus, are unsuitable for the type of higher resolution video resulting from the QXGA image resolution standard. As discussed in the specification at pages 3 and 4, for example, the type of video circuitry used in conventional KVM video switches, such as Chen uses, are either Resistor-Transistor Logic (RTL) comprised of resistors and

bipolar transistors or prohibitively expensive Large-Scale Integration (LSI) circuits which are undesirable at the speeds required by higher resolution video standards such as QXGA. The RTL circuitry disclosed in Chen is not capable of operating in the frequency range of 400MHz, and any attempt to make prior art systems using LSI circuitry capable of operating in this range would be prohibitively expensive, whereas applicants' unique solution of using discrete radio frequency switches, such as depletion mode MOSFET devices, effectively and efficiently solves this problem as well as solving the problem of the roll-off effect present in some prior art high speed video systems employing KVM switching.

Thus, Chen, the primary reference relied upon by the Examiner in the outstanding rejections, uses diodes and bipolar transistors for switching the video which are unsatisfactory at the speeds required by higher resolution video standards such as QXGA. Moreover, whereas Chen uses a single positive voltage power supply, applicants use an efficient and cost effective negative voltage power supply. There is no suggestion anywhere in the art of record of using depletion mode transistors for video switching applications, much less for the type of KVM switch called for in the claims. There is nothing in the art which suggests or teaches modifying Chen to substitute discrete radio frequency switches (which are absent from Chen as noted by the Examiner at page 6 of the Office Action) which enable the uses called for in the claims for the lower speed RTL circuitry of Chen which does not permit this. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner merely attempts to make piece meal combinations without relying on any teaching or suggestion in the prior art for such combinations, instead using applicants' disclosure to provide the "20-20 hindsight"

Application No.: 10/038,998
Amendment Dated: January 18, 2006
Reply to Office Action Dated: October 19, 2005

required to modify Chen and make it what it isn't; namely a high speed video switch using discrete radio frequency switches instead of a low speed switch using RTL. It is respectfully submitted that such hindsight modification of Chen is impermissible under the applicable law and the claims as amended are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested..

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, entry of the amendments, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this paper, please contact the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as Express mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 18, 2006.


Lawrence G. Kurland, Reg. No. 24,895

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Lawrence G. Kurland
Registration No. 24,895
BRYAN CAVE LLP
1290 Avenue of the Americas
36th Floor
New York, NY 10104-3300
Phone: (212) 541-2000
Fax: (212) 541-4630